



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/015,029	12/11/2001	Bradd A. Kadlecik	POU900142US1	6367

46369 7590 02/10/2005

HESLIN ROTHENBERG FARLEY & MESITI P.C.
5 COLUMBIA CIRCLE
ALBANY, NY 12203

EXAMINER

ROMANO, JOHN J

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2122

DATE MAILED: 02/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/015,029

Applicant(s)

KADLECIK ET AL.

Examiner

John J Romano

Art Unit

2122

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 December 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11 December 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/11/2001</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claims **1-38** are pending in this action.

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The Information Disclosure Statement filed on December 11th, 2001 has been considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims **1-38** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Davidson et al., US 6,042,614 (hereinafter **Davidson**).

4. In regard to claim **1**, **Davidson** discloses:

- *"A method of facilitating debugging of transactions, said method comprising..."* (E.g., see Figure 14 & Column 5, lines 45-51), wherein the transaction comprises the requested object.
- *"...executing a transaction on one processor of a plurality of processors, said transaction having debug information associated therewith ..."* (E.g., see Figure 6 and 7 & Column 8, lines 58-65), wherein Figure 6 shows the client application to be executed with

debug information comprising the debugger GUI (94) and the DBX engine (98) and Figure 7 shows the system in a distributed system environment which comprises multiple processors.

- *"...requesting, by said transaction, a service on another processor of said plurality of processors ..."* (E.g., see Figure 8 & Column 9, lines 6-11), wherein a DOE environment a server, comprising another processor of said plurality of processors, services requests from a client executing a transaction.
- *"...wherein at least a portion of said debug information follows the transaction to the another processor for use in debugging the transaction on the another processor wherein a path of the transaction is not predefined to a controller of the debugging."* (E.g., see Figure 14 & Column 11, lines 52-57), wherein the dbx-engine comprises the said debug information and is attached or follows the transaction on the another processor wherein a path of the transaction is not predefined.

5. In regard to claim 2, the rejection of base claim 1 is incorporated. Furthermore,

Davidson discloses:

- *"...attaching said debug information to said transaction being executed on said one processor."* (E.g., see Figure 14 & Column 12, lines 16-24), wherein the debug information is attached.

6. In regard to claim 3, the rejection of base claim 1 is incorporated. Furthermore,

Davidson discloses:

Art Unit: 2122

- *"...providing, by the controller to the one processor, at least a part of the debug information, and wherein the at least a portion of said debug information is provided to the another processor independent of said controller."* (E.g., see Figure 10 & Column 14, lines 50-64), wherein a found server host tells the local host that a dbx-engine is non-existent and thus implements a request independent of said controller.

7. In regard to claim 4, the rejections of base claim 1 are incorporated.

Furthermore, **Davidson** discloses:

- *"...including the at least a portion of the debug information in a communications session established with said another processor."* (E.g., see Figure 9 & Column 10, lines 1 and 2), wherein communications capability is disclosed for a communication session.

8. In regard to claim 5, the rejections of base claim 1 are incorporated.

Furthermore, **Davidson** discloses:

- *"...information relating to said transaction."* (E.g., see Figure 14 & Column 12, lines 40-50), wherein the request id (line 40), is included.

9. In regard to claim 6, the rejections of base claim 1 are incorporated.

Furthermore, **Davidson** discloses:

- *"...an identifier of the controller of the debugging."* (E.g., see Figure 14 & Column 12, lines 40-50), wherein the client inter-process address (line 41) is included.

Art Unit: 2122

10. In regard to claim 7, the rejections of base claim 1 are incorporated.

Furthermore, **Davidson** discloses:

- "...a client workstation coupled to said one processor and said another processor." (E.g., see Figure 2 & Column 7, lines 43-47), wherein a client workstation would be the workstation initiating the client application.

11. In regard to claim 8, the rejections of base claim 1 are incorporated.

Furthermore, **Davidson** discloses:

- "...executing an application on said another processor." (E.g., see Figure 7 & Column 38, lines 58-65), wherein an operation or application may be executed on another processor.

12. In regard to claim 9, **Davidson** discloses:

- "A method of facilitating debugging of transactions, said method comprising..." (E.g., see Figure 14 & Column 5, lines 45-51), wherein the transaction comprises the requested object.
- "...using a client workstation to enter debug information on a processor where a transaction is to be started, the debug information being associated with tracing the transaction ..." (E.g., see Figure 5 & Column 8, lines 9-36), wherein the debugger may be employed on a client workstation as shown in Figure 3. Further, debug information or commands may be entered via the GUI where the transaction is initiated and tracing is associated with the debug information (line 16).

- *"...attaching at least a portion of the debug information to the transaction being executed on the processor ..."* (E.g., see Figure 14 & Column 11, lines 52-57), wherein the dbx-engine comprises the said debug information and is attached or follows the transaction on the another processor wherein a path of the transaction is not predefined.
- *"...requesting, by the transaction, a service on another processor; and passing at least some of the at least a portion of the debug information to the another processor..."* (E.g., see Figure 8 & Column 9, lines 6-11), wherein a DOE environment a server, comprising another processor of said plurality of processors, services requests from a client executing a transaction.
- *"...wherein tracing of the transaction can continue on the another processor."* (E.g., see Figure 9 & Column 10, lines 3 and 4) wherein the dbx-engine comprises continuing debugging including tracing on the another processor.

13. In regard to claim 10, the rejections of base claim 9 are incorporated.

Furthermore, **Davidson** discloses:

- *"...without performing a debug registration process between the client workstation and the another processor."* (E.g., see Figure 9 & Column 10, lines 3 and 4) wherein the dbx-engine comprises continuing debugging including tracing on the another processor without a registration process.

Art Unit: 2122

14. In regard to claim **11**, the rejections of base claim **9** are incorporated.

Furthermore, **Davidson** discloses:

- "...without having the client workstation provide the at least some of the at least a portion of the debug information to the another processor." (E.g., see Figure 5 & Column 8, lines 9-36), wherein the only information included in the transaction is what is necessary to return the information to the client workstation where the debugging is actually taking place.

15. In regard to claim **12**, the rejections of base claim **9** are incorporated.

Furthermore, **Davidson** discloses:

- "...without predefining to the client workstation the path taken by the transaction." (E.g., see Figure 2 & Column 8, lines 58-65), wherein the client does not know which server will be used for the execution of a call.

16. As per claims **13-24**, this is a system version of the claimed method discussed above, in claims **1-12**, wherein all claimed limitations have also been addressed and/or cited as set forth above. For example, see **Davidson's** system for a distributed debugging environment (Figure 2 & Column 16, lines 15-18).

17. As per claim **25**, this is a system version of the claimed method discussed above, in claim **1**, wherein all claimed limitations have also been addressed and/or cited as set forth above. For example, see **Davidson's** system for a distributed debugging environment (Figure 2 & Column 16, lines 15-18).

Art Unit: 2122

18. As per claim 26, the rejections of claim 9 are incorporated. Furthermore,

Davidson discloses:

- "...a communications protocol..." (E.g., see Figure 5 & Column 8, lines 16-20), wherein a communications protocol is included.

19. As per claims 27-38, this is a program storage device version of the claimed method discussed above, in claims 1-12, wherein all claimed limitations have also been addressed and/or cited as set forth above. For example, see **Davidson** (Figure 1 & Column 7, lines 35-43), wherein, a CD-ROM medium, which typically contains programs and data is taught.

Conclusion

20. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Wygodny et al., US 6,202,199 B1


21. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John J Romano whose telephone number is (571) 272-3872. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-5:30, M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Q Dam can be reached on (571) 272-3695. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2122

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JJR



WEI Y. ZHEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER